

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION**

STACEY HASLEM ROBERTS,)
Plaintiff,)
v.)
UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE,)
Defendant.)
CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:20-CV-450 (MTT)

ORDER

Plaintiff Stacey Haslem Roberts has moved for the Court to reconsider its Order dismissing her amended complaint for failure to state a claim (Doc. 6). Doc. 8. Roberts's motion is **DENIED**.

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.6, “Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice.” M.D. Ga., L.R. 7.6 (emphasis added). Indeed, “[r]econsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly.” *Bingham v. Nelson*, 2010 WL 339806, at *1 (M.D. Ga.) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). It “is appropriate only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law.” *Id.* “In order to demonstrate clear error, the party moving for reconsideration must do more than simply restate [her] prior arguments, and any arguments which the party inadvertently failed to raise earlier are deemed waived.” *McCoy v. Macon Water Auth.*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D.

Ga. 1997). Here, Roberts has raised no change in the law, newly discovered evidence, or clear error in the Court's previous Order.¹

Accordingly, Roberts's Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 8) is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 5th day of January, 2021.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell
MARC T. TREADWELL, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

¹ Roberts does argue, however, that she filed two complaints, and thus she is maintaining two separate lawsuits. Doc. 8 at 1. That is incorrect. The second complaint Roberts filed was her opportunity to recast her original complaint to explain how the defendants violated her rights. Doc. 3 at 4. In its Order directing Roberts to recast her complaint, the Court was explicit that once Roberts filed her amended complaint, the Court would not look back to the facts in the original complaint but instead would rely only on the amended complaint. *Id.* at 5.